EUROPE.

The Alabama Claims Question Before the British Peers.

Earl Russell and the Lord Chancellor on Mr. Seward's Position.

Mr. Disraeli on the Conspiracy Against the Church.

The Cunard mail steamship Australasian, Captain McMicken, which left Liverpool at eleven A. M. on the 28th and Queenstown on the 29th of March, arrived at this port yesterday morning, bringing a mail report, in detail of our cable despatches, dated to her day of sailing from Liverpool.

ENGLAND.

The Alabama Claims—Earl Russell in Defence of the English Position—What Does Mr. Seward Really Ask?

In the House of Lords on the 27th of March Earl Russell said:—I rise for the purpose of calling your lordships' attention to the commission on the Neutrality laws and of moving for any further correspondence that may have taken place between this government and the American government respecting the Alabama and other claims. My object in so doing is that we may avoid falling into an error just the opposite of that into which many members of both Houses of Parliament were disposed to fall a few years ago. During the progress of the civil war in America it was evident that a considerable number of members were hardly prepared to perform in good faith all the duties of neutrality towards the United States and to abstain from everything to which that government could justly take exception. I remember that when on one occasion I had mentioned the "so-called Confederate States" a noble lord, then in opposition, said I might just as well have spoken of the "so-called United States," and the same noble lord indulged in a panegyric upon Mr. Laird, who, in my view, was usurping the prerogative of the Crown and endeavoring to make war on his own account, thereby running the risk of involving this country in hostilities. It will also be remembered that, in the presence of a large company of members of the House of Commons, Mr. Laird said he was proud of having fitted out the Alabama, and much preferred being the builder of that vessel to having made such a speech as Mr. Bright had recently delivered. Moreover, some noble friends of mine objected very strongly to our allowing ships fitted out in this country for the purpose of running the blockade to be subject to the common law of nations, which exposed merchant ships to the risk of capture if they carried anything contraband of war. They were for protecting such ships by the naval force of this country. I find that the danger now is of a totally different kind. *I find that the partiality for the South has altogether ceased, and that instead of the difficulty which I had to encounter as the Minister of the Crown, in performing the duties of neutrality, there is a difficulty in preserving the proper position and dignity of this country against unreasonable or unfounded demands.* Not that I think any objection can be taken to the course that has been pursued by the American government. It is only natural that people who suffered from the capture of their merchant ships and the destruction of their property should come to us for redress. They have stated their case very temperately, and it is not from them that any of the excitement which has lately prevailed has arisen. It is persons in this country who, when the excitement respecting these claims was entirely allayed in America, have raised the question anew, being apparently apprehensive that we shall have to meet the heavy claims which have been preferred. Under these circumstances I fear that the government may be so pressed that, either by negotiation or by the introduction of a bill into Parliament at a time when the business of the session is hurried through—or, perhaps, by both modes—*our position as a neutral nation may be endangered, and we may concede demands to which, as an independent Power, we ought not to submit.* Now, just before I left the Foreign Office I had a correspondence with Mr. Adams, and I cannot mention that gentleman's name without expressing my high esteem and respect for him—(hear, hear)—the value I place upon his character, and the assurance I feel that in conducting business he did everything which honor and good faith and moderation could prescribe. While carrying out the orders of his government his invariably conciliatory conduct tended to render easy what would otherwise have been an almost impossible task. (Hear, hear.) When about to leave the Foreign Office I wrote to Mr. Adams, stating the whole case of the British government, and about a fortnight afterwards an answer was received by my noble friend, Lord Clarendon, going through the points on which I had touched. I had stated that I thought the conduct of the United States towards Portugal in 1818 was such as might advantageously be followed, since when some Portuguese ships had been captured by privateers fitted out in America they did all that was required by their neutral position and by their dignity as an independent State. Mr. Adams, at the commencement of his letter, stated that on that point he entirely agreed with me, that there was no need of carrying on any correspondence upon the law of the case, since the two governments were agreed upon it. I had expressed a hope that there might be some legislation which would tend to ascertain more precisely the position of neutrals and on which both Powers might agree. Mr. Adams, remarking upon this, said:—

> So long as the heavy list of depredations upon American commerce consequent upon the issue of a succession of hostile cruisers, built, fitted out, armed, manned and navigated from British ports, continues to weigh upon their minds it would be the height of assurance to expect any common legislation.

Upon this Lord Clarendon, in a letter dated the 2d of December, 1865, remarked:—

> It is, nevertheless, my duty in closing this correspondence to observe that no armed vessel departed during the war from a British port to cruise against the commerce of the United States.

Thus, while there was an agreement respecting the law of the case there was the widest difference with respect to the facts. The noble lord who now holds the seals of the Foreign Office differed from me, inasmuch as he thought it would be wise to submit the question to arbitration. I did not anticipate any great advantages from such a course, but I saw no reason whatever against his adopting it if he believed it would lead to beneficial results. But as to the questions to be submitted to arbitration, I own I cannot concur with her Majesty's present government. It seems to me that Mr. Adams having stated that a succession of hostile cruisers, manned and armed by this country, had been sent out to prey upon the commerce of the United States, and Lord Clarendon having distinctly denied that assertion, the first thing for an arbiter or for any commission that might be appointed to investigate would be the facts. If it was found that there had been armed vessels, or even if there had been vessels built and equipped in this country that had gone out to prey on the commerce of the United States, it would then become a substantive question to ascertain whether there had been any want of due diligence on the part of the government of this country. In the meantime it would seem to be useless to place so vague a question before an arbiter as whether this country was morally responsible for that which had been done during the war. Evidently that would be an entirely independent question. I know not in what manner any arbiter or commission could proceed unless first to ascertain the facts of the case. * * * I own it seems to me that we have already in spirit *gone far enough in our neutrality laws*. It would be a wise precaution to give greater power to the executive government over armed vessels attempting to leave our coast for belligerent purposes. But if we were by treaty or by law of the realm to impose such further obligations as I have just mentioned, and if we, *as a ship building country*, engaged to stop unarmed vessels from leaving our coast, that would be a dangerous obligation into which her Majesty's government ought not to enter. Another suggestion has been made with regard to the Alabama claims and our differences with America. It is understood to have been made by Mr. Seward—namely, that every other question with regard to which we have had controversies with the United States as to the meaning of treaties and the occupation of territory should be considered at the same time, and that we should come, if possible, to some general agreement on all these points. I believe that to be a very wise and practicable suggestion, and at all events we should endeavor to settle all these matters. My lords, I will now ask my noble friend how soon the report of the Neutrality Commission will be laid on the table.

The LORD CHANCELLOR—This time last year, as the noble earl has stated, a royal commission was appointed to inquire into and consider the character, working and effect of the laws of this realm available for the enforcement of neutrality during the existence of hostilities in other States with whom her Majesty is at peace, and further to report what, if any, change ought to be made to give them increased efficiency and bring them into full conformity with her Majesty's international obligations. * * * The other question put by the noble lord is as to any correspondence which may have taken place between her Majesty's government and the government of the United States in reference to the Alabama and other claims. There is no correspondence subsequent to that which has been already laid before Parliament by my noble friend the Secretary of State. I hope the noble earl will not consider I am wanting in courtesy or respect if I decline to follow him into the somewhat large and difficult field upon which he has entered. I feel quite satisfied, as I am sure your lordships do, that when the noble lord at the head of the Foreign Office felt it to be his duty to decline the arbitration for the settlement of these claims proposed by the United States, he acted from a high sense of public duty, I think you will be of opinion that, in the progress of public sentiment upon this subject, and as time went on and public prejudice and passion much abated, my noble friend the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs did that which was eminently desirable for the maintenance of good relations between this country and the United States when he consented to refer to arbitration the question of these claims. If I rightly understand the noble earl, the doubts which he suggested as to arbitration of that kind were really only two. The noble earl, as I understood him, said that the case upon our side as regards these claims was an extremely clear one, and that we were not chargeable in any way or manner in which the United States contended we were chargeable. It is no reason for declining arbitration that you have an extremely good case to submit to the arbitrators. On the contrary, I think that would be rather a good reason why we should not shrink from having the case alleged against us referred to a tribunal of that kind. The other objection which the noble earl mentioned was this—he said there was a controversy on a matter of fact at the very commencement of the claim which was made by the American government. He stated accurately that Mr. Adams had contended that armed ships had left the ports of this country, whereas Lord Clarendon had taken issue on that point and had denied that any ships which could be properly so described had left the ports of this country. Questions of fact are just as necessary to be referred to arbitration as questions of law. I should desire to know how a question of fact of that kind, asserted on one side and disputed on the other, is to be determined unless you are able to evoke the aid of some independent arbiter or tribunal, who will decide the fact as well as he will decide the law. I think, therefore, none of these grounds could afford any reason why we should decline arbitration. I do not desire to say more with regard to the state of the negotiations than to remind your lordships exactly how they now stand. As the noble lord the Secretary of State said elsewhere, we have now conceded that which in the first instance the American government required—that is to say, that there shall be arbitration as to the liability of the government of this country with regard to the claims in question. But beyond that, and since that concession on our part, the American government, through their Foreign Minister, have made a further demand, *and they require now not merely that we shall refer to the arbitrator whether this country is liable in respect of these claims, but also that it shall be referred to the arbitrator, as a matter to be decided, whether this country acted properly or improperly in recognizing the seceding States as belligerents at the time this country so recognized them.* In answer to that the argument of my noble friend has been so simple, and I venture to say so conclusive, that in a very few sentences I will remind your lordships of it. My noble friend contended in the first place that that question is altogether irrelevant to the claims arising out of the case of the Alabama and of other ships, and irrelevant for this reason: it has never been disputed on either side that there was a time at which, beyond all doubt, the recognition of the United States as belligerents must have been proper and necessary on the part of this country. (Hear, hear.) If we take that time—it matters little whether it be a month sooner or later—about the month of July, or the date of the battle of Bull run, then it would be many months before the time at which the Alabama left this country, which was in the April following. Next, my noble friend has contended that, according to the priciples of international law, according to all authorities on international law, according to the authorities recognized by the United States government itself, the question whether a neutral Power shall at any particular time recognize a state of war between two Powers which are actually at war is a matter entirely to be decided by the neutral Power itself, and that there are no data upon which any arbitrator or independent tribunal can be called upon to pronounce whether the recognition was proper or was improper. Thirdly, my noble friend has contended—and this, perhaps, will be quite sufficient even if there were no other argument in the case—that before the government of this country recognized the Southern States as belligerents the government of the United States itself had recognized the Southern States in that capacity by declaring the blockade of their ports, which could be declared only upon the footing that a state of war existed. My noble friend has pointed out that if the question were to be reopened it would go further than the United States has proposed, because it would entitle us to claim compensation for all captures made by the United States government of ships that were breaking the blockade. That is the stage at which the negotiations—I hope only for the present—have come to a halt. The noble earl referred, in words which I am sure would find a response in the minds of all your lordships, to the character, great eminence and ability of the distinguished statesman who has been so long the Minister to this country of the United States, and whose departure from this country in that capacity we all, I am sure, extremely regret. (Hear, hear.) I could not help being much struck by some observations made by that very eminent person a few days ago. Speaking on the subject which has now occupied your lordships' attention, Mr. Adams is reported to have said:—"The sum of all true diplomacy is to be found in the Christian maxim of doing to your neighbor that which you would he should do to you, and where the will is good a way of arrangement is sure ultimately to be found." My lords, I think we have shown substantially that our will for the adjustment of this difficulty is good. I am willing to take according to the letter what Mr. Adams states of the will and inclination of the American government. It will be strange, indeed, my lords, if with that state of mind on both sides an arrangement of this difficulty does not before long present itself. (Hear, hear.)

Lord WESTBURY (the whole of whose remarks could not be distinctly heard) wished to offer a few observations, which, he said, would be elicited by the regret he felt that these negotiations for arbitration had been suspended for a time. He thought they were suspended under some misapprehension of the nature of the claim intended to be brought forward by the United States. It was extremely desirable to ascertain with accuracy what ought to be the condition of the arbitration. In the discussion of this matter we often heard the phrase "international law" and "breach of international law." No word could be more inappropriate to express the mutual obligations between nations than the word "law," for there was no law whatever. There were, however, certain rules which had been agreed to by civilized nations, and which derived their authority and force merely from the consent of their governments. Throughout the whole of these discussions false notions were incidentally suggested by the use of the phrase "international law."

The Lord Chancellor wished to correct two errors into which his noble and learned friend had inadvertently fallen and which, if left unnoticed, might create some misapprehension elsewhere. His noble and learned friend had put a very ingenious construction upon the demand made on the part of the United States government by Mr. Seward. All he could say was that the explanation which his noble and learned friend had offered *had never been given by Mr. Seward himself, and for this very good reason, that if all that was desired was that the premature recognition, as it was termed, of a state of belligerency was to be made a topic of evidence before the arbitrator going to support claims in other respects, that was not a thing to be stipulated for beforehand.* It was a question for the arbitrator who was the judge of what was relevant and what was not. It was a thing unheard of that a submission to arbitration should contain a reference to what was to be adduced in evidence before the arbitrator. The other error he desired to correct was the statement of his noble and learned friend that the negotiations had broken off. The exact point at which they stood was this:—*Mr. Seward's last communication contained a proposal in somewhat general terms of a commission to inquire into all the claims. His noble friend had requested Mr. Seward to describe more accurately what would be aimed at by that commission and he was now awaiting Mr. Seward's explanation.* (Hear, hear.)

Premier Disraeli on the Church Crisis—Cabinet Attempt at a "No Popery" Agitation—The Union of Church and State.

When the Australasian left Liverpool the position taken by Mr. Disraeli in regard to the Irish Church was producing a cry of "No Popery" in some quarters, and the following letter, addressed by the Premier to Lord Dartmouth, as President of the National Union of Conservatives and the Constitutional Associations, was attracting attention. He says:—

> 10 DOWNING STREET, March 24, 1868.
>
> MY LORD—I have received with pride and gratitude the memorial of the Council of the National Union of the Constitutional Associations connected with that body, in which they express their confidence in me and their thorough determination to support by all means in their power the government I have formed by the command and with the approval of her Majesty. Such expressions of feeling on the part of influential bodies of my countrymen are encouragingly opportune. We have heard something lately of the crisis of Ireland. In my opinion the crisis of England is rather at hand; for the purpose is now avowed, and that by a powerful party, of destroying that sacred union between Church and State which has hitherto been the chief means of our civilization and is the only security for our religious liberty. I have the honor to remain, my lord, yours, sincerely,
>
> B. DISRAELI.
>
> The Right Honorable the Earl of DARTMOUTH.

Disraeli Endorsed by Lord Derby.

Viscount Nevill forwarded for publication the following letter, addressed by Lord Derby to the Earl of Dartmouth, in reference to a resolution passed by the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, expressive of regret at his retirement from public life:—

> ST. JAMES' SQUARE, March 27, 1868.
>
> MY LORD—I have to acknowledge with the liveliest gratitude the address which your lordship has done me the honor of transmitting to me on behalf of the National Union and the numerous constitutional associations whose names are annexed, kindly expressing their regret at my retirement from office, and their hope that I should be enabled to take a part in the political business of the country. It is not without a pang, and only under a conviction of the absolute necessity of the step, that I found myself compelled to ask permission to withdraw from the service of a Sovereign to whose gracious favor I am so deeply indebted; and to sever my official connection with a party which for so many years has honored me with its confidence, and for many members of which I entertain a personal as well as political regard. It was, however, very satisfactory to me to be empowered to transfer the office which I had the honor of holding to one whose co-operation and friendship I had enjoyed for more than twenty years, and who, I am persuaded, will prove himself not unmindful of those great constitutional principles which it has been the study of my life to uphold, and to which, so far as my health will permit, I shall not cease to give my earnest though unofficial support. I have the honor to be, my lord, your obliged and faithful servant,
>
> DERBY.
>
> The Earl of DARTMOUTH.

The Cabinet "Change of Front"—Cause and Danger of the Movement.

The London *Times*, speaking of the Cabinet tactics, says it is an axiom of war that a change of front in the face of an enemy is a dangerous expedient which should never be attempted except in cases of extreme necessity. Mr. Disraeli has more than once approved this axiom as equally true in political life. Yet Mr. Disraeli's administration yesterday effected this doubtful movement. Lord Stanley's movement is entirely at variance with Mr. Disraeli's previous statements of the policy of the Cabinet. At the beginning of the week Mr. Disraeli declared his intention to meet Mr. Gladstone's resolutions in a most direct and open manner. A day or two later he yielded to the temptation of addressing a constitutional nobleman in a manifesto designed to rally round himself all the friends of the English Church by a liberal use of the *sophism that the Irish crisis was more properly an English crisis*, and the maintenance of the Irish Establishment was essential to the continued existence of the Church of England. No spark of enthusiasm had been evoked by this appeal. The crisis was alarming, and a change of front was determined upon and has been adopted at all hazards. Lord Stanley's amendment breathes no open defence of Mr. Gladstone's policy. It admits the possible expediency of modification, and asks only that the question of disestablishment or disendowment should be reserved for the decision of a new Parliament. The London *Times* adds:—"We are reluctant to say that Lord Stanley's amendment, or, to speak more strictly, the amendment Lord Stanley has fathered, is dangerous, but there is no other word applicable to it. The government have sought to escape from a critical position by the dexterous use of ambiguous words.

Church Rates Abolition—The Catholic and Presbyterian Collegiate Education.

In the House of Lords on the 26th ultimo the Compulsory Church Rates Abolition bill was read for the first time, and the second reading was fixed for the 30th of March.

In the House of Commons on the same evening Mr. Fawcett gave notice that at an early day after Easter he should move the following resolution:—

> That in the opinion of this House the Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and other inhabitants of Ireland ought to be placed upon an equality with those of the Established Church, and that all the fellowships, professorships and scolarships of Trinity College, Dublin, should be removed.

Mr. Fawcett said he intended also to move for a select committee with the view of administering and arranging the revenues of that college, so that it should more properly fulfil the functions of a national university. The House went into committee on the army estimates, and a number of votes were agreed to without discussion.

The British Volunteers.

On the volunteer vote an interesting conversation arose in the House of Commons, during which urgent appeals were made to the government for further assistance, in support of which it was alleged that additional aid was indispensably necessary, inasmuch as many of the most efficient volunteers, especially among the artisan classes, were unable to bear the expense thrown upon them, more particularly for renewals of uniform, and that many of the officers were compelled to make good any deficiencies in the present grant.

Sir John Pakington indignantly repudiated the insinuation that the government was indifferent to the volunteer movement. On the contrary, they felt the utmost admiration for the zeal and patriotism of the volunteers, and if they had consulted their personal inclinations they would have readily complied with the applications made to him; but they were obliged to consider the demands which at the present time were made upon the public purse, and to take into consideration the increased amount of the estimates this year.

Brilliant Reception by Madame Disraeli—Mr. Adams Obtains a Grand Citizen Chance.

On the evening of the 25th of March the Premier and Mrs. Disraeli held a grand reception in that wing of the new government offices in Downing street, London, which will in the future be devoted to the purposes of the Foreign Office. The affair was of a most brilliant description and the occasion of the gathering together of the principal notabilities of the British metropolis. The Prince and Princess of Wales, the Duke of Cambridge and the principal foreign ambassadors, including Mr. Adams, United States Minister, were present during the evening. This was the first reception given by Mr. Disraeli since his election to the post of Premier.

The Cotton Trade.

On the 26th ult. a numerous deputation representing all branches of the cotton trade, and headed by Mr. Bazley, M. P. for Manchester, waited on the Duke of Richmond, President of the English Board of Trade, to again urge the government to introduce into Parliament a bill providing for the periodical collection and publication of cotton statistics. Various arguments were adduced in support of the movement. The Duke of Richmond concurred in the opinion that the subject was one of great importance, and intimated his intention to bring the matter before the Cabinet, with whom its treatment must rest.

THE COURTS.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

The Erie Litigation—Conclusion of the Argument on the Appeals.

Before Judes Barnard, Ingraham and Cardozo.

Yesterday morning Mr. David Dudley Field appeared at the Supreme Court, General Term, before Judges Barnard, Ingraham and Cardozo, to close the argument on the appeals from orders made at Special Term in the great Erie Railway litigation. The main portion of this argument was, of course, devoted to the discussion of the principal appeal, which was that taken from the order of Mr. Justice Barnard appointing George A. Osgood receiver of the proceeds of $10,000,000 worth of Erie stock, alleged to have been issued in violation of an injunction.

Mr. Field argued that if the proceedings on which the appointment of Mr. Osgood was made were regular his opponents should have directed some portion of their argument to maintaining this point on the preceding day.

Mr. Charles A. Rapallo objected to Mr. Field raising this question now, as under the ruling of the court on Tuesday they were restricted as to the time to be devoted to the argument, and it was not fair to call upon them now to go further on that question.

Mr. Field resumed, and argued that the appointment of the receiver was made without proper grounds, and it was an unusual exercise of the power of the court, even if Mr. Skidmore, on whom the papers were served in court, could be considered as representing the Erie Railway Company, Mr. Skidmore had never been charged with having possession of the money, and the affidavits showed that the company never had it, and the order was made without notice to any person in whose possession the funds then were. Still, if the parties who had the money were then before the court no case for the appointment of a receiver had been made out. Plaintiff acknowledged that the stock charged to have been issued in excess was issued in conversion of bonds which had been issued for the purposes of the company, and such issue of bonds was allowed by the general railroad law. But it was said to have been issued in violation of an injunction. Now, was it the injunction in the suit of the people, or was it some other injunction? It would be a new doctrine to assert that a violation of an injunction in one suit may be avenged by the plaintiff in another suit when the parties to that suit do not complain. There was no evidence to show that the stock was issued in violation of the injunction in the Schell suit. The statute provided that there must be a regular contempt proceeding to punish for the violation of an injunction, and it could not be grounds for the appointment of a receiver in any case. But without any reference to the merits of the proceeding the injunction granted by Judge Clerke, and which was brought to the notice of the court and counsel on the day the order was made was an insuperable obstacle; that injunction was treated with contemptuous disregard, and had it not been for the discretion of counsel the court would have vacated the order at once, instead of disregarding it. But to go back to the 14th of March, and consider what occurred on the proceedings in the matter of the attachment of Mr. Diven. Counsel were not then thinking of anything further, as, the attachment having been served, the proceeding was out of court. One of the counsel then rose in his place and said, "I now ask for an order to show cause why a supplemental complaint should not be filed and a receiver appointed."

Mr. Rapallo suggested that it be made returnable on Monday morning, but the court said, "Let it be made returnable forthwith," and thereupon took the papers, and without examining them inserted the word "forthwith," and handed them back. Counsel then handed the papers to Mr. Skidmore, who was arranging his bail with the Sheriff, and in less time than one could walk across the room three times Judge Barnard said, "Draw up an order appointing George A. Osgood receiver, with security in ten millions of dollars."

Mr. Field concluded by saying that it was for the court to say whether such a thing should be established as the rule of the court. But the law of the land had something to say on that subject; the practice of the courts had something to do with it; the due order of judicial proceedings was involved in the question, and the respect which the law-loving and law-abiding people of this State should feel for the ministers of justice would depend in no small degree upon their decision.

The court then took the papers, reserving its decision.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

The Gould Contempt Case—Important Question Concerning a Chair—Judge Barnard Declines to Hear the Case.

Before Judge Barnard.

A large crowd of persons assembled yesterday afternoon in the Supreme Court, Circuit room, in anticipation of further developments in the contempt proceedings against Jay Gould, one of the directors of the Erie Railway Company, who had been attached for violation of the injunction in the suit of Richard Schell versus the Erie Railway Company. The contempt alleged consists in the participation by the defendant in the issue on the 9th of March last of about $10,000,000 worth of Erie stock, in violation of the injunction. Every available inch of space was occupied in the court room, as it was expected that Mr. Dudley Field would be placed upon the witness stand, and would give the other version of the incidents related in the testimony of John B. Haskin, reported in the HERALD of yesterday. Many prominent public officers, railway attachés, semi-officials and *quidnuncs* were on hand and a grand time generally was expected, as it was believed that all the parties would be fully prepared to renew the impromtu contest of the preceding day.

Upon Judge Barnard taking his seat Mr. Horace F. Clark asked the court to direct one of the officers to bring him a chair.

Judge Barnard replied that he did not think Mr. Clark would require a chair, as on consultation with some gentleman whom he had a right to consult he (Judge Barnard) had determined that instead of this examination taking place before him as an officer of the court, the parties should make affidavits before some suitable person as referee, and that upon their being brought into court such portions of the testimony as were relevant to the contempt case of Jay Gould would be considered, and those not relevant would be disregarded and thrown aside.

Mr. Pierrepont wished to know what disposition would be made of the testimony already taken.

The Court—The testimony that was taken of "Judge" Haskin yesterday was, to use the language of a gentleman I have just left, outrageous and scandalous, and should be stricken out as a mark of respect for the court.

Mr. Pierrepont inquired whether the whole of it was to be stricken out.

Judge Barnard—Yes, the whole of it.

Mr. Clark thought they were entitled to such portions of the testimony as were relevant.

Mr. Pierrepont said that as they had gone on taking some testimony—the testimony of Mr. Edwards, for instance—he wished to know whether his Honor would make any order in reference to that.

Judge Barnard—If the counsel appearing for the people desired to examine Mr. Edwards on affidavit they could do so, the same as the other witnesses.

Mr. Pierrepont asked what was to be done with the testimony already taken; was it to be wasted?

Judge Barnard—It will be stricken out, not wasted.

Mr. Pierrepont wished to know whether the court declined to let them go on with the examination of Mr. Dudley Field.

Judge Barnard—Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. Pierrepont said that on the examination of Mr. Haskin, yesterday, that gentleman had testified to circumstances connected with a conversation between himself and Mr. Dudley Field, and he thought it would be only proper that Mr. Field should have the same opportunity of making his public statement of that affair as had been given to Mr. Haskin, and they were entitled to that as a matter of right and justice.

Mr. Clark regretted that Mr. Field was not to be allowed to go on the witness stand as he desired as earnestly as Mr. Pierrepont did to have the opportunity of examining Mr. Field.

Mr. Pierrepont said that was what he wanted.

Judge Barnard stated that that was what he did not want. He had already been busily engaged during the day in the other court room, and did not intend to sit here to gratify impertinent curiosity.

Mr. Clark said he called Mr. Haskin yesterday as a witness to ask him no questions that were not relevant to the contempt case. There had been testimony adduced on that examination which was scandalous, but he had not brought it out and was not responsible for it. All that remained to be done now was that his Honor should appoint some honorable, high minded man, against whom each party should have no objection, before whom this examination could be had, so that either party might have the right to an *ex parte* examination. He thought Mr. Brady and himself could agree upon some such suitable person as referee.

Judge Barnard said an examination of the parties before a referee was not necessary, until such time as the witness refused to give his testimony. In regard to the examination of Mr. Field, he (Mr. Field) could make his affidavit *ex parte*, and would have the same publicity given to his testimony as had been given to that taken yesterday.

Mr. Brady said he appeared this afternoon exclusively to attend to the examination of Mr. Field. Of course he had had no notice on his side of the case that there had been any conference between his Honor and other eminent gentlemen as to what course should be taken. He had come to take charge of Mr. Fields' case, and as regards whatever had happened he took the whole resonsibility of it. It belonged to him exclusively—every question, every suggestion, as it would also belong to him hereafter. He simply asked now that Mr. Field have the opportunity to be heard in the matter publicly, as the other witnesses had been.

Mr. Clark, in reply, said that he would give Mr. Brady a promise that if he lived he (Mr. Brady) should have the opportunity of examining Mr. Field before a referee, if they could agree upon a gentleman who should be acceptable, and concluded by asking the court that an order be entered which would enable them to secure the attendance of Mr. Jay Gould on the examination to be had, or he might not be in custody when required for the purposes of the case. One of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas had issued a writ of habeas corpus requiring cause to be shown why Mr. Gould should be held to bail, and after having him brought before the court had him committed to the custody of an officer of the Court of Common Pleas, who had let him run away. Mr. Gould did not appear before that court yesterday on the hearing of that case, but was reported to be in Albany. He merely desired, so far as he was concerned, that nothing should be wanting to compel the parties to answer for this extraordinary effort to bring into contempt the administration of justice in this great State.

Judge Barnard, in reply to Mr. Field, who asked for the appointment of a referee, said that he had made the only order in the case he would make today, and that the matter would now stand adjourned until Thursday next at three o'clock P. M.

The crier adjourned the court, and the large (and largely disappointed) audience withdrew.

The Dissolution of the Erie Injunctions to be Argued To-Day.

Before Judge Sutherland.

Richard Schell vs. The Erie Railway Company et al., &c.—A number of motions in the Erie litigation were on the calendar of this court yesterday, and on this case being called Mr. Dudley Field answered, "Ready for the motion."

Mr. Vanderpoel, who appeared on behalf of the Vanderbilt party, stated that he was not prepared to proceed owing to the absence of some of the counsel associated with him, Mr. Fullerton being then engaged in trying a case at the Circuit, and he wished to know whether his Honor would reach this case in its regular order.

Mr. Field said he understood there were about sixteen counsel engaged on Mr. Vanderpoel's side of the case, and he did not think that the absence of one of them was a reason why the case should be adjourned.

Judge Sutherland said the case then before him, and which was unfinished from the preceding day, would occupy about two hours, and that another case was ready which would occupy the remainder of the day.

Mr. Field asked that the motions might be set down for to-day, when Mr. Vanderpoel desired to know whether the court intended to sit on Good Friday.

The court said that Judge Ingraham had said that Chambers was sometimes held on Good Friday, but he could not tell whether such holding of court referred to litigated motions.

After a little further colloquial exercise, in which allusions were made to the court over which Pontius Pilate presided on the day of which this is the anniversary, the motions were placed on the calendar for to-day.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—CHAMBERS.

The Erie Litigation—The Gould Contempt Case—Habeas Corpus Proceedings.

Before Judge Barrett.

The People ex rel. Jay Gould vs. The Sheriff of the City and County of New York.—This case, which was adjourned owing to the absence of the relator, came up for hearing this morning at the sitting of the court. Messrs. Burrill, D. Dudley Field and J. T. Brady were counsel for Mr. Gould, and Messrs. Fullerton, Vanderpoel and Rapallo for the Sheriff.

Mr. Vanderpoel inquired whether Mr. Gould was in court.

Mr. Burrill observed that he did not know whether the court had been informed with regard to Mr. Gould being detained by illness.

The Court—That matter was referred to yesterday, and affidavits were read in corroboration of the statement.

Mr. Burrill said that all that could be done was to let the matter stand over until Mr. Gould could be got here. Mr. Gould, owing to his illness, was not in a condition to leave Albany. The other side of course had a right to decline proceeding with the investigation in his absence. He did not know whether the other side disputed the fact of Mr. Gould's illness.

Mr. Vanderpoel—We dispute the right of Mr. Gould to leave the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. Burrill read the statute to the effect that sickness was a sufficient excuse for absence in such cases.

Judge Barrett, referring to the conduct of the officer who had been deputed to go to Albany to arrest Mr. Gould, said—The position of the officer was this: he telegraphed to the effect that Mr. Gould was sick in bed in his room, and that there were two physicians attending him. He asked me whether he (the officer) should come to New York to make a statement to that effect. I received the telegram at twelve o'clock at night. I immediately telegraphed to the officer, stating that he had done wrong in going out of the county, that I was surprised he went to Albany, and as it was that it would be entirely improper to come back to New York, because in doing so he would be giving up the custody of Mr. Gould. I therefore directed him, as he had done wrong and by way of making amends, to keep the prisoner in his close custody, and if he wished to prove his statement it must be done by some other person than himself. As soon as the officer returns I shall be very much inclined to take the prisoner out of his custody. He has placed me in a very embarrassing position in the whole matter.

After some discussion the case was adjourned till Saturday morning.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—IN BANKRUPTCY.

Important Decision—A Bankrupt Charged with Swearing Falsely as to His Property—His Application for Discharge Refused.

Before Judge Blatchford.

In the Matter of William D. Hill, Bankrupt.—Judge Blatchford yesterday morning rendered a decision in the above mentioned case. The discharge of the bankrupt is opposed by William S. Preston, a creditor. The specifications in opposition filed by the creditor aver that "the evidence taken before the Register shows beyond all reasonable doubt that the bankrupt has wilfully omitted from his sworn and filed schedule and inventories property which in truth and fact belonged to him at the time of making his said schedule and inventories—to wit, a certain house and lot, situated in the village of Kingston, claimed to have been purchased by his wife of Jeremiah Russell. The Judge, with reference to the above, says:—The bankrupt and his wife and other witnesses have been examined. I have carefully gone over their testimony and am entirely satisfied that the allegations of the specifications above referred to are fully proved. The case is one of a deliberate attempt by the bankrupt to defraud his creditors and yet procure a discharge from his debts. He has wilfully sworn falsely in his affidavit annexed to his inventory of property, and on his examination before the Register, in the course of the proceedings in bankruptcy, in regard to material facts concerning the property owned by him at the time of filing his petition in bankruptcy, he has concealed his property by covering it up in the name of his wife and has been guilty of fraud, contrary to the Bankruptcy act, by not delivering to his assignee property belonging to him at the time of filing his petition and inventory, and which he was not permitted to retain under the provisions of the act, and has made a fraudulent gift or transfer of property to his wife, contrary to the provisions of the act.

Cooke and Lounsbury for bankrupt; W. Lawton for creditors.

Petitions Filed Yesterday.

Charles P. Levy, Poughkeepsie, Dutchess county—Referred to Register Beale.

Stoner S. Haight, New York city—Referred to Register Fitch.

Edward Behrard, New York city—Referred to Register Dayton.

Joseph Kemposer and Nathan Kemposer, New York city—Referred to Register Allen.

Albert W. Rood, New York city—Referred to Register Dwight.

Joseph Murphy, New York city—Referred to Register Ketchum.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

The Right of Citizens to See the Public Records Denied—The Cornell Mandamus Reversed.

Before Judges Barnard, Ingraham and Sutherland.

The People, ex rel. Henry, vs. Charles G. Cornell, Street Commissioner, &c.—Yesterday, the appeal made by Mr. O'Gorman, Corporation Counsel, from the order made by Judge Barnard granting to a citizen the right to inspect the papers in the office of Street Commissioner Cornell came on to be heard. It will be remembered that on September 6, 1866, Mr. Richard M. Henry, a member of the Citizens' Association, appeared in the Supreme Court and made an affidavit that he had applied to the Street Commissioner for leave to see and inspect certain contracts in the Street Department relating to the public works of the city and that the Street Commissioner refused to allow him to inspect them. Judge Barnard thereupon granted a mandamus requiring the Street Commissioner to permit Mr. Henry to see those contracts or show cause to the contrary to the court. The Street Commissioner appeared in court and made an affidavit admitting that he had charge of the contracts for the benefit of the city and its citizens; that Mr. Henry had asked to see all the contracts for the year 1863; that he (the Street Commissioner) was fearful that the records in his office might be destroyed if any citizen could come in and see them whenever he chose; also that it would keep a larger number of clerks and more office room to accommodate such persons, if their right to see the contracts was established. Judge Barnard, however, decided that the Street Commissioner was bound to show the contracts in his office to Mr. Henry, thus establishing the right of any citizen to examine the public acts and records of the city officials. Mr. O'Gorman appealed from Judge Barnard's decision, and the argument of appeal was heard yesterday morning. Corporation Counsel O'Gorman appeared for the late Street Commissioner, Mr. Cornell, and Joseph F. Daly, the counsel of the Citizens' Association, appeared in support of the decision.

After full argument the court reversed the order below, thus deciding that the citizens had not the right to such inspection. Richard O'Gorman for appellants; J. F. Daly for respondent.

The Gas Contract of the Common Council—The Injunction Appealed From.

Christopher Pullman vs. The Mayor, &c., the Common Council and the Street Commissioner.—In 1866 the Common Council of this city passed over the Mayor's veto a resolution directing the Street Commissioner, Charles G. Cornell, to advertise for proposals and make a contract to supply the city with gas. From the terms of the resolution and other facts it was understood that this contract was to be made with some new gas company and for a long period. Mr. Pullman, who was then a member of the Common Council, protested against this resolution, on the ground that it would authorize and was intended to authorize a contract for twenty years, binding the city to pay over $1,000,000 a year for a supply of gas; that at the then high price of gas and coal (1866) it would be wasteful and ruinous to make a twenty years contract. Finally Mr. Pullman, failing to stop the scheme in the Common Council, applied to the Supreme Court for an injunction to restrain the making of such a contract. Judge Barnard granted the injunction, and this injunction has been held ever since. Mr. O'Gorman, the Corporation Counsel, who opposed the injunction in the first instance, now brings an appeal from it to the General Term, and the argument on it was had to-day before a full bench (Judges Ingraham, Cardozo and Barnard). Mr. O'Gorman argued on behalf of the Common Council that Mr. Pullman had no standing in court and no right to bring this suit and obtain the injunction, because the act of the Legislature which authorized him to bring the suit was unconstitutional. Mr. Charles Tracy and Mr. Joseph F. Daly, for Mr. Pullman, argued in favor of retaining the injunction and in support of the law of 1864 (chapter 806), under which any member of the Common Council or other citizen may proceed to suit to restrain any unlawful waste of the public moneys.

The court reserved its decision.

R. O'Gorman for the city; Charles Tracy and J. F. Daly for the respondent.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Controversy—A Receiver of the Proceeds of the New Stock Appointed.

Before Judge Cardozo.

James Fisk, Jr., vs. The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company et al.—Judge Cardozo yesterday rendered the following opinion and decision on the motions in this case, which were argued before him about two weeks since:—

Cardozo, J.—I shall not follow the counsel over the extended field of discussion in which they indulged on argument of the motions in these cases. The statement of a very few plain and well recognized propositions is all that is necessary to dispose of the questions really involved. My views may be briefly expressed as follows:—

First—Even if my reflection and examination led me to a different opinion (which they do not), I should not feel at liberty to deny the existence of the jurisdiction which it is sought to have the court entertain in these actions, since the point has been fully and distinctly decided by the General Term of this court in Griffith vs. Scott, cited on the argument. My views accord with that decision; but in any event I should consider myself bound to follow it. In that case Judge Ingraham said, "I think there can be no doubt but that a citizen of this State can maintain an action against a foreign corporation for any cause connected with the recovery of or protection to his property or rights in said corporation." Judge Leonard in the same case held that this court "has not the power to remove or appoint the trustees or directors of a foreign corporation, but it can enjoin their action when illegal or when acting fraudulently or unlawfully if they are personally within our jurisdiction." These remarks are apposite to the present suits and dispose of the point as to jurisdiction raised by the defendants' counsel.

Second—The issue of forty-nine thousand shares complained of was *ultra vires*. Neither the corporation nor its directors had in any view the right to make certificates purporting to represent capital stock, which had not in fact been subscribed and paid for, and to put them in the market as stock and sell them below par. If they might do so and sell them at a discount of one or two cent, they might sell them at fifty per cent or any greater discount. It is not a question of good faith or of honest intention or of wise policy or skilful or discreet management upon the part of the directors; it is question of power. Every paper issued purporting to represent stock which had in fact no existence was a false certificate, and the directors were not authorized to make false certificates. No such power attaches to their office, and the stockholders have the right to complain that they have assumed a power which was not conferred upon them. These views controlling the case are so familiar that they do not require the citation of authorities to support them.

Third—The statute passed by the Legislature of Iowa (Laws of Iowa, 1868, chapter thirteen) cannot alone ratify the act of the directors. The State of Iowa has not exclusive jurisdiction over this corporation. The certificates do not purport to represent stock of the original corporation created by the State of Iowa, but assume to represent stock of the consolidated company, consisting of that corporation and the one formed under the laws of Illinois. The latter State, therefore, has quite as much control of the present matter as the State of Iowa. Certainly the act of either alone will not aid the defendants.

Fourth—I see no reason why any injunction should have issued to restrain the defendants except so far as the 49,000 illegal certificates are concerned. The transfer of the illegal issue was properly enjoined, and the proceeds should be held by the court to protect the company against damages in favor of the holders of the false certificates or to enable it to retire them; but nothing is disclosed in the papers which satisfies me that it is either proper or necessary to prevent dealings in the genuine stock, or to interfere with the business of the corporation except to the extent I have mentioned.

Fifth—Respecting the motions to attach the defendants, I have only to remark that I do not think that any branch of the injunction has been established by the affidavits submitted to me calling for any present action.

Sixth—I shall appoint Hugh Smith (the Deputy City Chamberlain) receiver of the proceeds of the 49,000 illegal shares, requiring from him a bond, with surety to be approved, in $500,000, and directing that each half million of dollars which shall come to his hands as such receiver shall be deposited alternately in the United States Trust Company and the Union Trust Company.

Seventh—The costs of these motions will be costs in the actions and abide the event of the same.

Eighth—An order in accordance with these views and containing such provisions as may be deemed necessary to carry them into effect will be prepared by the plaintiffs' attorneys and presented to me for settlement.

Ordered accordingly.

COURT CALENDAR—THIS DAY.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—IN ADMIRALTY.—Nos. 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.—Nos. 77, 101, 104, 117, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 137, 139, 147, 148, 151, 159½, 164.

REAL ESTATE MATTERS.

Sales in New York and Brooklyn Yesterday.

Yesterday showed something of a revival in real estate operations, the attendance at the auction marts, both in this city and Brooklyn, being considerable. The general features of the market remain about the same—prices fair, bidding moderate and an increasing indifference, foreboding an early close of the season, being the main characteristics. Below are given the sales:—

BY A. J. BLEECKER, SON AND CO.

Mansion and 4 acres, Spuyten Duyvil, Meyer Goodkind	$28,500
Brown stone house and lot, 115 East 28th st, 22.10½x¾ block, John Curtis	27,500
Frame house and 4 lots n s 75th st, 70 ft w 3d av, each 25x¾ block, Alexander Ratzky	14,800
3 story brick house and lot, 43 Tompkins st, 20x100, Michael McDermod	6,500
1 lot n s 32d st, 200 ft e 11th av, 25x100, M Donahoe	2,000

BY E. H. LUDLOW AND CO.

No 6 Washington square, leasehold, lot 27.8x159.1	36,000
No 184 East Broadway, lot 26x70	10,750
4 lots n s 114th st, 300 ft e of 10th av, 25x100.11 each	1,625
No 57 Spring st, lot 25x110	15,400
No 73 St Mark's place, lot 25x¾ block	12,300

BY MULLER, WILKINS AND CO.

Buildings and lots n w cor William and Cedar sts, 41x69	80,000

Remsen Estate.

1 lot n e cor Boulevard and 107th st, 27.3x74	5,000
3 lots adjoining, each 26.11x103, each	4,000
3 lots adjoining, each 25.11x103, each	3,800
1 lot s e cor Boulevard and 108th st, 28x111	5,200
1 lot s s 108th st, 111 ft e Boulevard, 25x100.11	2,600
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	2,150
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	1,750
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	1,700
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	1,500
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	1,400
4 lots adjoining, each 25x100.11, each	1,325
4 lots adjoining, each 25x100.11, each	1,300
1 lot adjoining, 25x100.11	1,300
3 lots adjoining, each 25x100.11, each	1,270
4 lots adjoining, each 25x100.11, each	1,230
1 lot s w cor 10th av and 108th st, 25.5x100	2,100
1 lot adjoining, 25.2x100	1,550
2 lots adjoining, each 25.2x100, each	1,400
3 lots adjoining, each 25.2x100, each	1,400
1 lot adjoining, 25.2x100	2,500
1 lot, s e cor 10th av and 108th st, 25.5x75	1,800
2 lots adjoining, each 25.2x104, each	1,210
1 lot adjoining, 25.2x104	1,350
2 lots adjoining, each 25.2x100, each	1,275
2 lots, n e cor 10th av and 107th st, each 25.2x94, each	1,375
1 lot, n s 107th st, 100 ft e 10th av, 33x105	1,410
1 lot, n s 107th st, 74 ft e of Boulevard, 25x100.11	3,150
1 lot adjoining	1,900
1 lot adjoining	1,650
1 lot adjoining	1,625
1 lot adjoining	1,500
4 lots adjoining, each	1,375
4 lots adjoining, each	1,225
4 lots adjoining, each	1,280
4 lots adjoining, each	1,410

BROOKLYN PROPERTY.

The following sales were made yesterday at the New York Exchange Salesroom:—

BY JOHNSON AND MILLER.

5 lots n s of 3d place, 100 ft from Court st, each 20x133, G Lounsberry, each	$1,250
3 lots on 10th av, between Broxton and Sherman sts, each 20x97.10, R Willis, each	575
2 lots s e side of Columbia st, 375 ft from Pierrepont, each 25x101, Q A Butler, each	5,000
2 frame houses and lots, Nos 45 and 47 Hicks st, bet Middagh and Cranberry sts, plot 50x100, N Fannelly	14,900
3 story frame house and lot, No 872 Pacific st, lot 16.8x110, P Searles	31,925
House and lot the same size as the above 870 Pacific st, J Jones	3,900
Building and plot of ground corner of Vanderbilt av and Park place, plot 75x100, H R Foster	36,600
Brown stone house and lot 295 Court st, between Carroll and President sts, lot 22.6x93, R H Graff	15,800
Three story brick house and lot, s s of Degraw st, 350 ft from Smith st, R A Gray	10,000

The following sales were made at the City Salesroom, Brooklyn:—

Brick house and lot 234 Washington st, 175 ft from Johnson st, lot 16.8x70.3, Mr Burrows	$6,900
Four gores and one frame house on Douglass st, near Howard	900
Three lots on e s of Howard av, corner of Douglas st, each	280
Brick building and lot on corner of Dekalb and Vanderbilt avs, lot 20x60, J Jackson	10,500
Two brick dwellings and lots adjoining the above, on De Kalb av, Mr Martin, each	9,000
Brick dwelling and lot on the n s of De Kalb av 80 ft from Clermont av, lot 20x80, J Jackson	9,500
Brick house and lot No 75 Hamilton st, near Myrtle av, lot 18.9x100, E Gates	5,700
Two story brick house and lot on the n s of Gates av, 165 ft w of Marcy av, lot 20x100, T Finney	5,700
Three story brown stone house and lot e s of Hall st, 40 ft s of Greene av, lot 20x90, D Glacking	12,800
One lot on the e s of Houston st, 424 ft n of Myrtle av, 20x100, A Scranello	900
Two story frame house and lot, w s of Bedford av, 40 ft n of Van Buren st, lot 20x90, Mr Sweeny	4,880
Frame house and lot on Pulaski st, near Reid av, lot 22 x100, Mr Martin	3,325
6 lots on Quincy st, 100 ft from Nostrand av, each 25x 100, Robert Donald	18,000
Two story frame house and lot No 86 North 5th st, 60 ft from 3d st, lot 25x100, Herman Graff	2,000
Two lots on the s w cor of Bedford av and Penn st, each 25x90, Mr Seely	4,400
Brick house and lot No 281 State st, 49 ft from Bond st, lot 29.6x100, S J Hopper	16,900
Three story brick house and lot, 185 Degraw st, corner Cheaver pl, lot 20x75, Ann Hignett	9,000
Three story brick house and lot, 281 Henry st, 50 feet from Pacific st, lot 25x90, John Mulvey	9,000
Two story frame house and lot 83 Schermerhorn st, corner Boerum, lot 25x100, J Knight	8,200
Two story frame house and 4 lots, 40 ft on Lafayette av and 30 ft on Kosciusko st, 169 ft from Bedford av, B Cosgrove	10,800
Three story brick house and lot 11 W Baltic st, 305 ft from Clinton st, lot 21.2x99.10, J Brandon	8,400
Two story frame house and lot 81 Orange st, near Henry, lot 25x103, Mr Hill	7,500
Three story brick house and lot 107 Jay st, corner Prospect, lot 22x100, J G Migham	13,000

Official Transfers of Real Estate.

We give below a list of the official transfers and leases recorded yesterday in this city, Kings county, N. Y., and Hudson county, N. J., and in Westchester county on Wednesday:—

TRANSFERS IN NEW YORK CITY.

Bowery, Nos 305 and 307, ½ part; 1st st, Nos 3 and 5, ½ part; E 39th st, No 223, ½ part	$32,500
Canal st, No 361, 66.11x19.4x64.2x18.11	37,500
Elm st, No 199, 24.6x73.5	Nom.
Hester st, n s, 65.6 ft w of Allen st, 22x50	11,150
Madison st, n s, 29x100	7,000
7th st, s s, 108 ft w of av C, 25x90.10	15,500
9th st, n s, 263 ft w of av C, 20x92.3	8,250
W 10th st, n s, 165 ft e of Hudson st, 25x100	8,500
12th st, s s, 308.2 ft w of 2d av, 23.4x103.6	22,000
16th st, s s, 212 ft w of 7th av, 75x103.3	32,000
19th st, s s, 482 ft w of 5th av, 25x92	28,000
19th st, n s, 324.6 ft w of 2d av, 20x92	20,000
26th st, n s, 200 ft w of 8th av, 25x98.9	12,000
31st st, s s, 84 ft e of 2d av, 18x74.6¾	8,000
31st st, s s, 193.9 ft w of 8th av, 18.9x98.9	14,500
38th st, s s, 180 ft w of 6th av, 24x74.1	Nominal.
39th st, n s, 364.2 ft w of 5th av, 20.10x98.9	40,000
41st st, s s, 280 ft west of 6th av, 20x98.9	25,000
43d st, s s, 287.10 ft w of 8th av, 21.5x100.5	35,000
51st st, s s, 381.6 ft w of 8th av, 20.6x100.5	15,500
53d st, s s, 260 ft e of 3d av, 20x100.5	14,000
56th st, n s, 65 w of 2d av, 20x100.5	14,000
59th st, s s, 275 ft w of 5th av, 50x200.10	65,500
59th st, s s, 225 ft w of 5th av, 100x200.10	32,000
50th st, n s, 75 ft w of 2d av, 40x100.5	4,000
4th st, s s, 278 ft e of av A, 204.4x25x102.2x25x94.8½x46.7 x4	3,100
78th st and 1st av, s w cor, 25x100	3,500
15th st, n s, 97.6 ft e of 3d av, 17.1x100.10	4,500
Lot No 2 Delancey estate, 24x100	13,000
Lot 969 Bayard's farm, 25x94	6,500
Lots 433, 434, 435 Benson's estate	2,850

LEASES RECORDED IN NEW YORK.

Attorney st, No 171, store and basement, 3 years, per yr.	480
Bowery, Nos 145, 145½ and 147, 8 years, per year	5,000
Gold st, No 56, 6 years, per year	2,000
Hudson st, No 183, 1 year	1,400
Lewis st, No 22, first floor and basement, 3 years, per yr.	600
Water st, No 269, 5 years, per year	1,400
9th st, No 260, 1 year	1,175
9th st, No 164, 5 years, per year	2,250
3d av, No 468, store and cellar, 5 years, per year	2,250
3d av, No 390, 4 years, per year	2,500
4th av, No 85, 4 years, per year	1,000
4th av, Nos 320 and 322, 10 years, per year	4,000
5th av, No 8½, 5 years, per year	1,500
Av B, No 163, 3 years, per year	1,400

TRANSFERS IN BROOKLYN.

Baltic st and Perry av, n e cor, 123.8x88.2x110.7½	2,750
Bridge st, w s, 104 ft s of Tillary st, 21x108.6	6,000
Broadway and Walton st, n w cor, 92.2x60.2x79.8x55.6	6,000
Columbia st, w s, 50 ft n of Clarke st, 25x150	7,800
Congress st, n s, 115 ft e of Clinton st, 25x90	2,200
Delmonico place, w s, 107.3 n of Hopkins st, 34.2x25x27.4 x27.4	1,625
Ewen st, e s, 30 ft s of Varet st, 20x50	2,000
Hall st, e s, 240 ft s of Green av, 20x100	10,500
Hewes st, n s, 122.8 ft w of Harrison av, 44.8x100	1,450
High st, No 81	6,600
Hooper st, s s, 100 ft w of Marcy av, 22.8x100	780
Houston st, w s, 191.8 ft n of Willoughby av, 100x100	6,250
Kent st, s s, 300 ft e of Union av, 25x100	1,000
Main st, No 91	11,800
Pearl st, e s, 42.4 ft s of Prospect st, 21.8x67.7	6,000
Prince st, w s, 50 ft s of Willoughby st, 20x84	4,000
Ross st, e s, 254 ft s w of Wythe av, 22x100	800
Rutledge st, n s, lot 97 Wyckoff map (19th ward)	700
Skillman st, n s, 125 ft w of Ewen st, 25x100	1,400
Warren st, s s, 190 ft e of 4th av, 60x100; 4th av, e s, 20 ft n of Warren st, 40x82.2	Nom.
Washington st, w s, 44 ft s of Plymouth st, 50x75	7,150
Wilson st, s s, 325 ft e of Bedford av, 25x100	6,500
Walworth st, e s, 425 ft s of Park av, house and lot	4,500
North 2d st, s s, 175 ft e of 1st st, 25x100	2,400
North 2d st, s s, 125 ft w of Ewen st, 25x100	5,000
North 5th st, s w s, 218 ft n w of 5th st, 18.9x100	1,300
South 6th st, n s, 175.10½ ft e of 8th st, 49.1½x95	8,800
North 7th st, s s, 125 ft e of 3d st, 19x100	650
North 7th st, s s, 105 ft e of 3d st, 19x100	650
North 7th st, s s, 143 ft e of 3d st, 19x100	650
North 7th st, s s, 162 ft e of 3d st, 19x100	650
10th st, s s, 197.10½ ft e of 9th av, 25x200	3,000
North 10th st, s w s, 80 ft s e of 4th st, 70x100	2,000
18th st, s s, 182.3 ft w of 4th av, 26x126.4	1,950
Atlantic av, s s, 200 ft e of Utica av, 25x200	500
De Kalb av, n s, 75 ft w of Tompkins av, 40x200	1,900
Green av, s s, 175 ft e of Grand av, 50x200	1,800
Putnam av, n s, 100 ft w of Howard av, 50x100	600
4th av and 47th st, n e cor, 70x115.5x91.9	550
Lot 68, H Cary's map, Prospect st, s s	4,750
Lots 58 to 64 inclusive, Stewart's map (18th ward)	1,425

LEASES RECORDED IN BROOKLYN.

Kent and Little Nassau sts, 25x100, 7 years, per year	45

TRANSFERS IN NEW LOTTS.

New Lotts road and Sheepshead av, n e cor, irregular lot, 75 ft front	1,800
New Lotts road, n s, 80 ft w of Bennett av, 100.8x181.5x 85x183.6	1,130
West st, e s, 425 ft s of Sackett st, 100x100; Centre st, w s, 575 ft s of Sackett st, 100x100; Sackett st, s s, 425 ft w of Centre st, 100x100; Paca av, w s, 300 ft s of Sackett st, 50x100	4,200

TRANSFERS IN JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Mercer st, s s, 80 ft e of Jersey av, 24x100	11,500
Railroad av, 175 ft of w of Gilbert st, 25x56	600

WEST HOBOKEN.

Palisade av, w s, 25x100	1,800

HUDSON CITY.

Lots 13 and 14, block 8, Hudson Grove, 25x100	687
Montrose av, w s, lots 6, 7 and 8, block G, each 25x100	1,400
Newark turnpike road, s s, near Benedict's, 50x—	300

LAFAYETTE.

Washington st, lots 9 and 10, block 3, each 25x100	11,500

TRANSFERS IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY ON WEDNESDAY.

Lot in town of Rye (6), 8 acres	[illegible]
Lot in Lewisboro, 8 acres	[illegible]
Lots 51 and 52 West Farms, on Railroad av and Mott st, 300x50	9,000
Lot in Yonkers, s s Archer st, 50x50, 4 lots, each 90x50	4,750
Lot in Rye on Boston Post road, farm	7,000
Lot in West Farms on Boston road, 378x160	5,000
Lot 67, Yonkers, Ashburnham av, 91x50	6,250
2 lots in Morrisania (17 and 18 on block 7), on 138th st, near Willis av, 100x50	1,800
Lot in Mount Pleasant, on Beekman st, 125x50	4,250
House and lot in Bedford, on the Poundridge road, 1 acre	[illegible]
Lot in Lewisboro, along Connecticut State line, 2 acres	[illegible]
Lot in Peekskill, Armstrong av, 114x25	[illegible]
Lot in Courtlandtown, w s Washington st, 117x55	[illegible]
Lot in Yonkers, Chestnut st, 100x50	4,500
Lot in Yorktown, on the Peekskill road, 1¼ acres	1,800
Lot in Peekskill, on Smith st, 75x47	2,400
Lot in Peekskill, on Howard st, 100x81	450
Lot in West Farms, on the Hunt's Point road, 300x204	3,750